DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 881 52 IR 003 794

TITLE	Focus on the Future: A Report of the Interlibrary Cooperation Planning Institute (Columbus, Ohio, October 26-28, 1975).
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Library, Columbus.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	23p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Demography; Economic Change; Educational Trends; Financial Support; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Libraries; *Library Cooperation; *Library Networks; Library Planning; Library Role; Political Issues; Social Change; *Statewide Planning; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	*Multitype Library Cooperation; National Commission Libraries Information Science; *Ohio

ABSTRACT

A summary of speeches and discussions from the Ohio Interlibrary Cooperation Planning Institute includes the reports and opinions of library leaders and decision makers from academic, institution, public, school, and special librarians. The focus is on: long range planning for multitype library cooperation; the current status and future of networks, cooperatives, and libraries in general; the roles of all types of libraries in future intertype library cooperation; and the components of a statewide multitype library plan. Major presentations cover Ohio's recent interlibrary cooperation experiences; a 1975 reassessment of cooperation; demographic, social, and political changes; changes in the economy and in public library financial support patterns; education trends; the influence of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science; and strategies for cooperative development. A summary of group discussions, an outline of possibilities for future developments, and a list of participants are included. (LS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED126807

Ergo

A Report of the Inaugural Conference

at The Ohio State University

October 24-25, 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The State Library of Ohio 1976

CE 008 777

Facts on the Issue

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Interlibrary Cooperation Planning Institute was held at The Ohio State University's Fawcett Center for Tomorrow, October 26-28, 1975.

The purpose of the institute was to bring together library leaders and representative decision makers (such as librarians, public library trustees, public officials, and educators) representing academic, institution, public, school, and special libraries to:

(1) suggest procedures for developing a long range program for increased multitype library cooperation;
(2) describe and assess the development of networks and multicounty cooperatives (MCCs) in the past few years; the changed conditions under which libraries are now operating; and the direction in which they are going;
(3) examine the roles that all types of libraries might play in future intertype library cooperation;
(4) identify components needed in a statewide multitype library development plan.

The institute took place in a climate of reassessment: external conditions affecting libraries are changing and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science has developed a program requiring action in Ohio. The Ohio Library Development Plan (OLDP) became the Ohio Library Development Program with the enactment of legislation in 1969, and the ensuing years have witnessed the growth of nine multicounty cooperatives, the creation of one Area Library Service Organization and numerous formal and informal consortia, the phenomenal development and national recognition of the Ohio College Library Center, and growth and change in academic, institution, public, school, and special libraries.

The institute sponsor was The State Library of Ohio. An Institute Planning Committee of Ohio library leaders organized the program, arranged for speakers, and handled the difficult task of selecting the 100 participants from among so many capable and interested library people in the Ohio library community.

Their program was designed to promote maximum participation. Speakers and materials provided background information, and participant discussion constituted more than 40 percent of the institute time.

This report (which is a summary of conference speeches and discussion rather than complete proceedings) is intended to help Ohio library people focus on the future. It was prepared to: report on the institute, generate additional substantive discussion among librarians and trustees, and encourage use of an institute follow-up kit (which is being assembled) for further information and discussion. This kit includes a videotape of conference highlights and printed materials including the institute background paper, "Ohio Library Development and Interlibrary Cooperation," by Kevin Flaherty. These as well as videotapes of complete sessions may be obtained from Martha Driver, Planning Development Supervisor, The State Library of Ohio, who capably translated the Institute Planning Committee's program goals into a significant conference.

H. Paul Schrank, Jr.
Chairman, Institute Planning Committee

OHIO'S RECENT EXPERIENCE IN INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION

Today's interlibrary cooperation — the ALSO, multicounty cooperatives, TWXIL, OCLC, and formal and informal consortia — is a result of study and planning. In the early sixties Ohio librarians and trustees realized that long range planning should be based upon a study of service needs, strengths and weaknesses of library resources, and external factors affecting Ohio libraries.

In 1966 the State Library Board, in consultation with the Ohio Library Association Development Committee, commissioned Ralph Blasingame, Professor, Rutgers University Graduate School of Library Service, to make a major survey of Ohio libraries — the first such survey in over 30 years. Blasingame recruited a team of nationally recognized surveyors to design and implement the study.

The survey found wide disparity between public library services available in cities and suburban areas and those available in rural areas and small towns. The cities had developed consistently high levels of service, while many rural counties lacked even basic resources. All libraries faced problems of staff recruitment and financing.

Publication of the survey findings signaled the beginning of an intensive period of planning, highlighted in 1968 by the OSU Library Standards and Planning Workshops in which the Ohio Library Development Plan was hammered out.

The Ohio Library Development Plan incorporated Blasingame's three basic recommendations: first, the development of area library service systems; second, the establishment of a reference and information network to meet specialized information needs; and third, the development of the State Library. More importantly the Plan identified state and local responsibilities and the role of the various library associations in the development of library service, stressing the importance of ongoing local assessment of needs and regional planning to meet these priorities and provide dynamic library service.

The Ohio Library Development Plan was overwhelmingly approved by OLA and OLTA in October 1968, and became the basis for the 1969 legislative program of Ohio libraries. In August 1969 Governor James Rhodes signed Senate Bill 262, and the Ohio Library Development Plan became law.

This launched a period of remarkable growth of interlibrary cooperation on a regional basis. Within a year public libraries in 34 counties were actively involved in planning for Area Library Service Organizations. Today 175 libraries (including some academic and institution libraries) in 73 counties are participating in regional cooperation. These include nine multicounty cooperatives and one Area Library Service Organization (ALSO).*

OVAL, the Ohio Valley Area Libraries, is the only ALSO established to date. Ten of OVAL's 11 counties are in Ohio Appalachia, an area larger than the state of Connecticut that encompasses over 13 percent of Ohio's land area. OVAL ranks last in the state in per capita library support, $2.09 in 1974 as compared with the statewide average of $5.44. OVAL has received $664,000 in state aid funds since 1973 for collection development, consultant services, and a reference and interlibrary loan contract with Ohio University in Athens.

OVAL and the nine MCC's include 64 percent of the state's public libraries and some 46 percent of the state's population. These cooperatives have been developed as a result of local initiative. The counties participating are self-selected in that neither the State Library nor the OLDP Steering Committee prescribed regions or combinations of counties. Because the MCCs were organized before 1973, they are not coterminous with the uniform planning districts designed by the Governor in that year.

The tremendous expansion of, and radically different patterns in, interlibrary lending is another important development of the past six years. The development of multicounty cooperatives and networks appears to have increased interlibrary lending by several times among public libraries from 1970 through 1975, and shifted a greater proportion of interlibrary loan work from the State Library and a few union catalog member libraries to regional networks. Multicounty cooperatives, which have been developed largely since 1970, accounted for an estimated 27,000 book loans in 1974, arranged through area resource libraries.

MCC and ALSO development have centered on public libraries, but multitype interlibrary cooperation is rapidly becoming more significant. A major factor in this cooperation is the Ohio College Library Center. OCLC has increased the ability of Ohio libraries to cooperate in meeting user needs by reducing the cost of technical services and increasing bibliographic control; the OCLC data base also offers another channel for interlibrary loan. Nearly all Ohio academic libraries are OCLC members, and 19 public and 10 school and special libraries have joined since membership was opened to them in 1973. Some additional 44 public libraries and two-year campus libraries utilize OCLC through the State Library Catalog Center.

The Ohio Library Development Plan outlines state responsibilities for library service, but there is some pessimism about the state's willingness to provide the funds necessary to implement it fully. The Ohio General Assembly has had opportunities to fund the Ohio Library Development Plan in 1971, 1973, and 1975. In 1971 Governor Gilligan

*Two forms of regional organization, the ALSO and the multicounty cooperative, resulted from a policy decision that federal funds should not be used for ALSC operations, and that ALSO development should be financed with state aid funds. This decision was based upon discussions in the 1970 Ohio State University Library Standards and Planning Workshop and the advice of the OLA/OLTA Library Development Plan Steering Committee. Important distinctions emerged between the ALSO and the multicounty cooperative in matters of scope, financing, and legal organization: state funds are provided for the ALSO, which is intended to assure a full range of essential library services, and an ALSO Board is formed by the participating libraries under Sec. 3375.70 of the Ohio *Revised Code*. Multicounty cooperatives, on the other hand, are funded under short-term LSCA grants, are intended to meet one or more priority needs identified by the cooperating libraries, and are administered by one of the participating libraries under contractual arrangements.

recommended full funding for the Ohio Library Development Plan but tied his recommendation to the proposed repeal of the intangible tax. In 1973 the first ALSO was half funded. In 1975 severe fiscal retrenchment prevented full ALSO development.

Although the ALSO program has not been fully funded, the OLDP has served as the basis for a broader based plan, *The Ohio Long Range Program for the Improvement of Library Services.* This document is the benchmark against which cooperative programs funded by LSCA grants are measured. The goals of *The Ohio Long Range Program . . . ,* developed five years after the OLDP, more fully recognize the need for coordinated development and the significant role of academic, school, and special libraries than does the Ohio Library Development Plan.

Still, the past six years have witnessed important cooperative efforts in all types of libraries. Regional film centers have been created to serve schools and school library media centers on a multicounty basis. They were initiated with grants from the State Department of Education when the State film service was discontinued in 1972, and are partially financed by the participating school districts.

Academic libraries have also developed resource sharing plans. In addition to the resource sharing benefits derived from participation in OCLC, some 26 academic libraries, under the aegis of OCLC, participate in a direct borrowing program in which individuals from any campus can use the library facilities of other campuses. Thirteen seminaries and religious study institutions form the Consortium for Higher Education Religion Studies (CHERS).

Multitype library consortia have developed in four areas of the state (Cincinnati, Cleveland, Dayton, and Toledo). The two earliest of these were the Library Council of Greater Cleveland and the Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium-Library Division. Academic libraries also play an important part in the Committee for Library Cooperation (involving the University of Toledo and Bowling Green State University), the Greater Cincinnati Library Consortium (involving 14 academic libraries), and the Northeastern Ohio Major Academic Libraries (NEOMAL).

Ohio librarians recognize that reassessment is timely. Examination of the program of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science raises questions for Ohio libraries, and changes in the economic and social picture also affect libraries. Public libraries face uncertainty about the future of the intangible tax and its ability to support library services. School libraries must resolve questions about standards and objectives of service. Academic libraries continue to wrestle with problems created by shrinking budgets. Institution libraries are embryonic in development.

The growth in interlibrary cooperation on a regional basis, the advent of multitype library consortia, and the increasing needs of library users are harbingers of another stage of library cooperation — a stage which may require expanded citizen participation in library services and decision making.

A 1975 REASSESSMENT OF COOPERATION

Miss Jean L. Connor, Former Director, Library Development Division,
New York State Library

TRENDS	CRITERIA
Rapidly deteriorating financial picture. Inflation. Recession. Greater competition for public funds. Inadequate funding at all levels.	Are the fiscal goals realistic? Defensible? Worth the effort? Equitable? Is the tax base sound? Are there fiscal priorities? Is there a financial partnership?
Increased emphasis upon planning at all levels...new methods...greater involvement. Need for evaluation, standards.	Is there provision for continuity of planning? For monitoring performance? For growth and change? Stated and measurable goals? Are needs met?
New kinds of structure or organizational relationships for the delivery of library service have emerged. Age of library systems. Cooperative approach. NCLIS proposal of state/federal relations.	Are all users, through some local outlet, given access to stronger resources through a cooperative structure? Is the governance of the structure representative, permanent, flexible? Are the kinds of systems clearly defined?
Library planning and service increasingly across type of library lines.	Has the role of each type of library been thought through and appropriate use made of existing strengths? Is there a means of communication across type of library?
Library service seen as an intergovernmental function, necessitating a partnership among local, state and federal governments, including intergovernmental finance. Need for careful articulation of the parts.	Has there been provision for differentiation of levels of service, as may be needed, and a definition of role for the various levels of government? Appropriate interface within the state? With other states? The nation?
Increased emphasis upon the role of the State. Recognition of the need for State level planning, leadership, coordination, and State finance.	State agency's role recognized? State agency's staff and resources commensurate with responsibilities? Who will speak for needs of State Library agency?
Advances in technology, including computer technology, telecommunication and micrographics have a profound effect; enable and compel libraries to work in larger units of service. Advances cut across geographical, political, institutional lines.	Potential of the new technologies realized? Coordinated planning for? Phase-in? What standards? What communication links? What delivery system?
Increased emphasis upon "outreach." The library's public understood to be both users and non-users. Service to a wide range of users . . . disadvantaged, minorities, handicapped, institutionalized.	Meet the needs not only of current users but potential users? Meet needs of handicapped? Blind? Programs of outreach to institutionalized?
Increasing emphasis upon the provision of a variety of media. Changing standards of collection development.	Does the plan provide access to the newer media and provide for their bibliographic control?
Increased awareness of the complexity and diversity of a library's relationships . . . to other agencies in the community, to art and culture, to broad educational community, to diverse institutions in the information field.	What philosophy of service undergirds the plan? Is the library understood to be solely a source of facts and information or something more?
Growing recognition of the need for continuing education, for new skills, new understanding. Specially need librarians skilled in designing, administering and evaluating systems and networks. Importance of human factor.	Is there provision for continuing education of staff, with special emphasis in upgrading of those who will carry systemwide or network responsibilities?
Greater politicalization of library cause. Awareness of need for good state and federal legislation, strong state and federal funding. Trustees and citizens have intensified lobbying efforts.	Is the plan defensible in the political process? Sound legally and fiscally? Time frame related to state budget and legislative process? What is the climate? Goodwill? Trust? Willingness to share in a sustained effort?

CHANGING DEMOGRAPHIC, SOCIAL, AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN OHIO

Dr. Henry L. Hunker, Professor of Public Administration and Geography,
The Ohio State University

Our society is undergoing a basic change in philosophy. During most of our country's history we have pursued a "quantity of life" set of objectives and have achieved a high level of satisfaction. We are living better than any other people in the world. Now we are beginning to work to improve the "quality of life"; the idea is not new but it has only been in the last 10 years that it has become an issue. (The environment is one aspect of that.)

This increase in emphasis on "quality of life" is causing an increase in the number and importance of service workers. The 7,400 staff in Ohio's libraries are service workers. We who are service workers (and I am one of them) are nonproductive in one sense: we don't produce things, we do produce intangibles. But we are in the growth sector of our society.

What does this emphasis on "quality of life" mean for Ohio's economic future? First let's look at population. Three conditions must be kept in mind. First, Ohio has traditionally been a growth state. Second, Ohio has traditionally outpaced its region and the nation in population growth. Third, Ohio does not now and has not in the recent past espoused a no-growth policy, although we have actually been practicing it, especially in terms of population. Since 1970 we have had the third lowest increase in population of any state in the nation. This situation is not inconsistent with other large industrial states. In Ohio, however, this is happening for the first time, and the rate of change is considerable.

We are still having a movement of people into the state, but a larger number are moving out. Those coming in are often persons with lower education, lower job skills, and lower income potential (a more conservative group of people) than those moving out. We need a more dynamic program to upgrade social and educational services to keep in Ohio the high quality person we are capable of producing.

The current trends of decreasing birth rates and increased out-migration suggest that by 1980 there will be only about two-thirds as many pupils entering the first grade as at present. It raises an interesting question: Will the reduced numbers result in quality education as opposed to quantity education? In other words is the "quantity of life" and "quality of life" a factor?

Another trend in the 1960's and '70's is "creeping metropolitanization." This is based upon the relationship between a central city and adjacent counties in terms of jobs and leisure activities. In 1960 Ohio had 15 central cities and 19 counties that were metropolitan. By 1970 the number of metropolitan counties had increased to 31. In 1975 there are only 16 central cities but over 38 metropolitan counties.

Ohio's economy has for a long time had an industrial base that produces the durable goods that improve the "quantity of life." Today about one-third of Ohio's labor force is employed in manufacturing, but the growth sector of the state's economy is the service sector. A program for the development of a basic industrial economy has flaws since it is premised on the assumption that in 1975 we have the same resources and the same locational advantages that we had 75 years ago. That just is not so. For example, changes in transportation have even reduced the importance of our geographic location.

Another problem with our industry in Ohio is that we have failed to respond to the challenge of technology. There has, in my opinion, been a failure of leadership in both the public and private sectors in responding to the needs of the high technology industries. At the state level we have been unwilling to invest in research and development, education, and the kind of industrial climate that will aid future growth industries.

Nationally more and more people are moving into the service sector of our economy. This today is the job generating sector; we increase services (and improve the "quality of life") by enlarging the service sector. This relates directly to you librarians. You are supplying a service to a large number of persons with growing needs, and increasingly these demands for service are coming from service workers themselves, as opposed to industrial or agricultural workers.

Much of Ohio's future depends upon our commitment to the "quality of life" concept. This requires more support from the citizenry as taxpayers (and the citizenry includes the business and industrial communities as well as individual citizens) because these services, these needs, require tax dollars. Improving the "quality of life" also requires greater support from the state which is the primary organization responsible for generating change. It means increased support for public services, especially those services such as research and development that generate return. Other public services are higher education, public education, and libraries. This selective approach to the future is not premised upon the past, upon the lagging edge of society. Instead it is at the forward edge of the thrust, where Ohio should be.

Any service activity is dependent both upon its users and upon those who provide support for it. It is conceivable in this rapidly changing society that new learning resources may be in greater demand than the books on which libraries have traditionally relied. Libraries must answer such questions as: Is the library's role to be the same in the inner city as in the suburb? Is it to be the same in the university community as in the rural hamlet? And finally, what are the alternatives to current library patterns of service given the kind of economy we are facing?

THE CHANGING OHIO ECONOMY AND PATTERNS OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Dr. Frederick Stocker, Professor of Economics and Public Administration,
The Ohio State University

Ohio's fiscal situation as it relates to libraries has elements that have been with us for quite some time, but it also has a few new elements. Let's consider both the old and the new elements and then what actions should and should not be taken to promote libraries.

One familiar item is heavy, almost complete, reliance by public libraries on the intangibles tax. This tax, in my opinion, is an inappropriate source of revenue for libraries. In principle, the tax is indefensible. It is a relic of the era in which the property tax was thought of as a comprehensive tax on all forms of assets. Following that theory, you tax stocks and bonds as one form of property. Today, however, the property tax is essentially a tax on real estate plus some classes of business personal property. So the tax on intangibles is an anomaly. Moreover, since the State of Ohio has a comprehensive tax on personal income, the tax on intangibles, to a large extent, constitutes double taxation. The sensible thing for us to do is to incorporate the intangibles tax into the base of our income tax. In addition, the intangibles tax is poorly enforced and in many counties it amounts to a voluntary contribution.

Secondly, the distribution system seems to me deficient in that it turns money back to the communities where it originates. This means that although the rate as imposed by the state legislature is uniform statewide, the richer a community is (that is, the more intangibles tax revenue it generates), the more money it gets back from this uniform state tax. Moreover, a local community has no opportunity under the intangibles tax to choose to tax itself more or less heavily. An additional problem arises because there is no clear test of need. In fact, distribution within counties on the basis of need is inherently arbitrary.

A third problem is the difficulty of breaking away from the existing situation. It is hard to design a satisfactory replacement fund or distribution mechanism. The library fund distribution system ought to meet three tests. It should be equitable in the distribution of money among counties. It should avoid wrecking the library systems of the six or eight largest cities. And it ought to be economical; it should not break the budget of the state government. To accommodate more than two of these criteria is a tough order. It is difficult for libraries to get their foot in the door on the property tax; it is difficult to break away from the existing system.

These are the old problems. What elements are new? First, there is the proven inadequacy of the intangibles tax. The growth in intangibles tax revenue has been less than all of us expected and hoped for. In addition, more counties are taking 100 percent of the intangibles tax revenue for libraries. This means that the opportunity for expanding library revenues by claiming a larger proportion of that fund no longer exists, especially in the large, urban counties.

Also new are the ravages of inflation as they are affecting libraries.

Another new element is the growth in dissatisfaction with the existing distribution system. More and more challenges are being brought against the county budget commissions on the basis of the determination of true need as opposed to claimed need. I do not see the entry of the Board of Tax Appeals into this conflict as a solution.

A fourth new element is the rising use of the local property tax by library systems. I have been interested and encouraged by reports of the growing number of systems that are going to the voters for approval of library levies. I believe this is one of the directions in which we must move.

Finally, also new is the worsening fiscal position of the State of Ohio. The State budget for this biennium is a bare bones budget and we can not be optimistic about any early change.

Several elements in the financial picture strike me as ominous. One is the opposition to higher taxes at the local and state levels. This, I fear, is a reflection of the growing skepticism on the part of taxpayers as to whether they are getting their money's worth out of state and local government. It is important now — and will become increasingly important — that those who are partisans of a particular program carry their case to the public and give creative thought to the question of how their services can be identified, defined, quantified, and made visible to recipients. Only then will they have bases on which to respond to the accusation, "You ask for more money, but you are not giving us anything more."

A second ominous factor is the growing willingness of the voters to chip away at the property tax base, since support for public libraries will have to come more and more from local levies on property. When we consider such proposals as the constitutional amendment on the November ballot to provide exemptions for new industry,* we must be cautious about their effects on the property tax base. The remaining unexempt owners then have to shoulder a larger portion of the burden, and, understandingly, they become increasingly resistent.

*This issue failed.

A third element is the growing consensus that we must modernize the business tax structure. The developing pressure in the legislature to reduce taxation of business tangibles (such as machinery and inventories) is significant because it would reduce state revenue. Also of importance to libraries is the possible revision of the state situs intangibles tax, a tax primarily on financial institutions. This outdated taxing method results in undertaxation of this component of the business community. While the funds generated do not flow to libraries, some library people have been eyeing them hungrily. My guess is that if Ohio turns its attention to revamping the business tax structure, the state situs intangibles tax — along with the local situs tax — may be phased out.

But let me point to one favorable element: the high elasticity of our state income tax. We are fortunate that we have an income tax with the capacity to grow more rapidly than personal income.

What are the implications for public libraries? In my opinion, it would not be realistic or desirable for library people to pin their hopes on expansion or even continuation of the intangibles tax. First, it seems to me that libraries ought to work toward the establishment of a state aid program to underwrite minimum standards of service throughout the state. Such a program should be designed to recognize the regional character of major metropolitan public libraries.

Second, you should work to expand the revenues of the State of Ohio. The best way, in my opinion, is expansion of revenue from the personal income tax. This tax has an enormous potential for increasing revenue without getting out of line with other states or imposing undue burdens on our taxpayers. Our state income tax rates are among the lowest in the nation. If over the long term we increase that source of revenue, we will make it easier to trade off the intangibles tax for some kind of library replacement fund.

Third, you should work toward adopting property levies. We need to create a pattern of library dependence on local property levies, and we need to establish the idea that it is appropriate for the inhabitants of a local community to tax themselves for part of the support of their local public library and not depend entirely on an earmarked statewide tax.

Fourth, libraries ought to make more use of user charges. Libraries are providing a high-cost service, some components of which do not significantly benefit society generally except as they benefit private individuals, and in most cases we are providing these services to people who are able to pay. Even if repayment were only a token towards imposing part of the costs of libraries on the people who use them for private benefit, it might strengthen the case of libraries in the eyes of the taxpayer.

And finally, libraries need to emphasize the value of the services they perform for their communities. If libraries are going to be increasingly dependent on the willingness of the local citizenry to pay for them, it is vital that the people have some notion of why libraries are important and why they should be supported.

TRENDS IN OHIO EDUCATION

Dr. Frederick Cyphert, Dean, College of Education,
The Ohio State University

What are some overall movements in education which affect libraries? First, schooling and education are less synonymous. People who at one time did not have to keep learning in order to continue holding a job now have to do so. This lifelong learning means that the average learner is significantly older than the person we considered a learner a few years ago. In the next decade, kindergarten through grade 12 enrollment in the United States will decrease by 11 percent and degree credit enrollment in higher education will increase by 8 percent. Adult participation in higher education will grow by about 7 percent per year, while youth participation in higher education will fall. More learning for those in school will be community-centered. It will occur in factories, museums, churches, and hospitals. It seems to me that the increasing age and experience of the learners will call for more sophisticated learning materials. The diversity of these learners in interests and abilities will create a demand for more varied materials.

As public school enrollment declines, schools will have increasing numbers of empty classrooms. Empty classrooms are embarrassing to school systems that have repeatedly asked for bond issues to build more and better schools. This will have some very practical implications for school libraries and the ways public libraries and school libraries might work together.

A second and perhaps even more pervasive phenomenon than lifelong learning is educational pluralism. "Egalitarianism" and "diversity" are the twin words at the moment. The current goal in education is to make individuals unique and proud of it, albeit tolerant of each other. In a relatively short time we have gone from being proud to be common to being ashamed to be common. This results in varying approaches to education, each demanding different instructional materials and different approaches to their use. In an open school you make a lot of materials available and the child selects what he will use; in a traditional school you use fewer materials more intensively and the choice of materials is made by adults.

How are libraries and librarians going to deal with the emotional reactions and the bitter conflicts which society reflects during this radical period of change? One way, I suspect, will be for library and school boards to be less a reflection of a community's conservative and cultured elements and more a cross section of that community.

The next few years will bring changes in educational decision making, with more of the major roles played by the states (the governor's office, legislature, and regulatory agencies), by federal agencies, and by education advocacy groups (teachers, unions, and other nonschool agencies), as opposed to decision making at the local level by administrators and boards of education. Closely related will be the increasing importance of the courts in education, not only in important court decisions but also in school policies and to protect children's rights. Schools will continue to be involved in social controversy as agents of change. Libraries cannot and should not remain aloof from this controversy.

Soon librarians might be in the materials-producing business, as well as in the materials-storage or materials-usage business. Increasingly, you will be expected to identify the resources available in neighboring libraries, museums, hospitals, and factories, and the college down the road. In some settings you will acquire these resources as well. You will be expected to catalog learning resources throughout the community, both material and human, to answer the question: Where is there a person who . . . ? A powerful and growing demand for learning opportunities exists. We have to be more flexible in our approach to learners than we have been in the past, with far less dependence upon lectures and books. We will need to be better at matching teaching styles with learning styles.

A third observable trend of education is the increasing emphasis upon the practical and vocational—the integration of work and learning. The goal of career education is that each student should have a salable skill by the time he or she leaves high school.

Now for a few predictions. It is likely that the fiscal squeeze now felt by governments, foundations, universities, and schools will not be a passing phenomenon. We will continue to live in an era of scarce resources with ever increasing competition for public revenue. Even if economic conditions improve and more money becomes available for social action programs, substantial new aid to education (or libraries) will not be a high political priority. Health reform, welfare reform, and attempts at income redistribution will probably be the dominant issues of the next decade. (One positive spinoff of fiscal limitations is that reduced faculty turnover creates opportunities to develop more sophisticated and interrelated educational programs.)

Most of today's problems that are worth solving, in my opinion, are far too complex to be solved by any one profession operating unilaterally. Somehow we have to learn to work together. We have to learn what each profession has to contribute and develop a common language to enable a concerted attack. I am quite confident that this is going to happen. As it does it will have impact upon what goes on in schools. I believe we have a mandate requiring teachers, principals, college professors, shop foremen, ministers, and librarians to place more emphasis on face-to-face, shoulder-to-shoulder, and yes, computer-to-computer joint planning and communication. Unless we work together the magnitude and complexity of our task will cause us, one by one, to be incapacitated.

I believe also that educators and librarians must become more responsive to a changing clientele. We must seek greater community involvement and input into goals and activities. We must aggressively and imaginatively pursue the major facets of society that we have not served well in the past. Perhaps this quotation may have been my thesis for today: "Forecasting is a very difficult business, especially when it has to deal with the future."

NCLIS AND THE STATES

Mrs. Kathryn Gesterfield, Director, Illinois State Library

The 1970 amendments to the federal Library Services and Construction Act required that each state library prepare a five-year, long range program for the development of library services. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare funded a workshop at The Ohio State University to instruct state library personnel in a planning and evaluation method developed here: the CIPP model. This stands for Context, Input, Process, and Product; it requires evaluation at each of the four steps in program development. Someone at the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) is aware of CIPP, because NCLIS is using the process in the development of its program. To date the Commission has taken only the first two steps. Because the NCLIS plan is so new (the final document was accepted by the American Library Association just this summer) and there has been a remarkable lack of financial support, NCLIS has yet to take the next two steps.

How did NCLIS get the information it needed? First, needs assessment hearings were held around the country. The Commission had studies made on questions that were raised in the hearings, and specialists wrote a number of position papers to guide the Commission in deciding how the parts fitted into a grand plan. The Commission prepared overall drafts, and last spring the third published draft became the Commission's program. The Commission has affirmed that the program will undergo constant revision, with the first to take place within two years. At this point, at least in Illinois, many people have had the opportunity to learn about the program through publications, conference programs, and discussions.

The program's eight objectives are not revolutionary. We in Illinois have been studying how our library development program meshes with these objectives, and I would like to share some thoughts on this with you.

In Illinois, objectives one and three are interrelated. These deal with the basic minimums of library and information services at the local community level and the strengthening of statewide resources and systems in developing library systems. We carefully consider the necessity of providing minimum services. Still, there are questions to be answered. Are the standards developed by the various types of libraries in Illinois the right ones against which to measure minimum services? What is the community — where we live, or work, or shop?

Last year in Illinois important new state legislation on library funding failed, but our systems law, now over 10 years old, is important. Today all but 10 public libraries in the state are members of the 17 cooperative systems, funded at 70¢ per capita and $25 per square mile. Chicago is a single-library system. Both population and square mile factors must be considered in funding the systems because of the great disparities in population density and geographic area. These systems provide a variety of services, but only to member libraries, not to individuals. They tie into a network of research and reference centers, enabling us to fill 87 percent of the information requests from all libraries in the state. Now that we have functioning networks, we must begin to coordinate their programs better. We must also encourage wider system participation by school, academic, and special libraries.

The second NCLIS objective — providing adequate special services to special constituencies including the unserved—is another objective of special importance to all of us. In the last four years we in Illinois have been able to implement the Library of Congress recommendation that services to the blind and physically handicapped be subregionalized. But we still have a long way to go in this area. While our state library works with librarians in correctional institutions, other state departments serve the mental and children's institutions. We have not yet been able to reach agreement with these departments to enable library systems to help improve library services in institutions. We still have two million people who cannot secure service unless they buy nonresident library cards. Still other special groups need attention, including the Spanish-speaking, disadvantaged, and, more recently, numbers of Vietnamese.

Planning, developing, and implementing a nationwide network of library and information service, as envisaged in the eighth NCLIS objective, is probably the most difficult thing we are asked to do, and I think it is because we are scared. Most of us feel we have to move cautiously because great networks are foreign to our nature and very expensive besides. We in Illinois are moving ahead in this area, however, and we look to the Commission for guidance. We are working with the Ohio College Library Center and other computer services, hoping these will enable us to tap resources for all the people in the state in a more efficient way.

Since the national network is still emerging, we must remain flexible to work with it. One thing is certain, we must have adequate services at the state and local levels and strong intrastate library networks if we are to participate effectively in the national network. I think there is still much to do in Illinois.

Recommended National Program Objectives of The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

Objective 1. Ensure that basic minimums of library and information services adequate to meet the needs of all local communities are satisfied.

Objective 2. Provide adequate special services to special constituencies, including the unserved.

Objective 3. Strengthen existing statewide resources and systems.

Objective 4. Ensure basic and continuing education of personnel essential to the implementation of a National Program.

Objective 5. Coordinate existing Federal programs of library and information service.

Objective 6. Encourage the private sector (comprising organizations which are not directly tax-supported) to become an active partner in the development of the National Program.

Objective 7. Establish a locus of Federal responsibility charged with implementing the national network and coordinating the National Program under the policy guidance of the National Commission.

Objective 8. Plan, develop and implement a nationwide network of library and information service.

EVALUATING STRATEGIES FOR COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT

Miss Jean L. Connor, Former Director, Library Development Division,
New York State Library

One of the trends I mentioned in my earlier remarks was the developing partnership between different levels of government for the provision and financing of library services. This partnership is also one of the recommendations of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. The Commission report called "Alternatives for Financing the Public Library" recommends a strengthened funding system to achieve improved balance between the levels of government over a 10-year period. This intergovernmental funding pattern would reach a level of support by the federal government at about 20 percent, the states at 50 percent, and local government at 30 percent. It is perhaps inevitable that a greater portion of library support must come from the state rather than local government, since the state alone has recourse to a broad tax base and the state alone can equalize between rich and poor areas within its boundaries. State taxation, such as an income tax, has the potential for growth at a time when there is increasing resistance to the local property tax. In Ohio, state support for libraries is under greater consideration because of the present status of the intangibles tax, and I think you must face the inevitability of change in that type of local support.

Other trends in library development also will mandate a greater reliance upon the state. One trend is toward larger units of service, many of them multicounty or regional in nature. When library service crosses local boundaries, the search for a larger tax base goes with it. Another trend is to special purpose networks within which we draw on resources from across local boundaries. Here we may encounter a large initial tool-up cost, as we do in automation; again this type of development leads us to an increased awareness of the need for state support. But even with extensive state funding, the forms of organization can protect local interests, as may be needed.

Given that a broad base of tax support is needed, what principles might underlie a distribution of state funds? Sometimes state money is used for one-time establishment or tool-up costs. Sometimes, as in Ohio, state aid is used for equalization of support among localities. State aid sometimes has a matching qualification. The aim here is to provide an incentive to increase local support or to promote certain desirable goals, such as further cooperation across type of library or geographical lines. State funds may be dedicated to the cooperative parts of the network rather than to aid for the member libraries, or they may be used to promote innovative development. All these uses are for maintenance and operation. At least one state, however, uses state funds for library construction.

Now even if it has been decided that the purpose of the state aid is "bread and butter" — operational money — it must still be decided whether it is to be used for the operation of every library in the state. Shall the poorest libraries be required to pull themselves up to minimum standards in order to qualify for state aid? Shall there be equal or greater funding for libraries that perform functions different from those offered by others? One must make these decisions about principles of distribution even after concurring that state aid should be increased.

If one considers how state funds can be distributed, one inevitably reviews the organizational building blocks of library cooperation. These days we seem to have the layered look: local libraries; systems, whether they be comprised of public libraries, unitype libraries, or multitype libraries on a regional basis; networks which cut across multicounty cooperatives and tie all or some aspects of the service program together; certain "star performing" libraries that perform some additional services for an area; and special function networks created for a given purpose such as centralized processing.

In addition to decisions about the general funding level, the general principles, and the organizational building blocks, other options are possible in drafting permissive legislation. There is simple authorizing legislation, such as Ohio secured in 1969. Or there is the approach in which a level or formula of funding is authorized in the legislation, and you fight your appropriation through each year. That is what happens under LSCA. Another method is the one used in New York State where the formula for the funding of each system is law. If the legislature adopts a formula in this way, they must vote the funds to cover it. The only way the legislature can reduce funding is to repeal the formula. Still another approach is through a general budget in which each year you must prepare and justify your budget request, citing such factors as increases in people served, area served, additional services needed, etc.

Ohio faces three challenges in finance. First, your local support is largely geared to the intangibles tax which may be a golden egg but today looks rather badly tarnished. Secondly, your multicounty systems are relying heavily upon federal aid which itself is in jeopardy. And finally, you desire to move ahead with new programs, forging a statewide multitype network which can serve as a base for a state-federal network. Since these three interrelated problems are coming into focus at the same time, you have an opportunity for innovative solutions.

Fortunately, Ohio library programs have assets. First, you recently enacted enabling library legislation. Second, you have achieved your first state supported Area Library Service Organization. Third, in recent years you have achieved great strength in your state library. And you have a fourth asset — climate. It seems to me that you have a climate in which your problems may well yield to sustained effort and skilled compromise. This could give you the potential to become a lead state in multitype development.

In her presentation, Ms. Connor used library development in several states as "case studies":

In 1950 we in *New York* recognized that the principle underlying our state aid program was wrong, that our state aid should support countywide systems rather than just put $100 more in every library's pocket. Then in 1958 we added flexibility to these systems with a law permitting the organizing of library systems across county lines.

We now have 22 library systems; some of these are cooperative while others are large consolidated city libraries. These systems offer a full range of services. In addition to interlibrary loan and uniform borrowing privileges, they have reference services, delivery services, processing, consultant services, continuing education, public relations, and others.

After a period of years in which we emphasized the development of stronger public library service through cooperative library systems, it was recognized that library service at the research level was not strong enough. In 1961 the Commissioner's Committee on Reference and Research Systems recommended that regional reference and research systems be established. Today the entire state is organized into nine such systems, including all public libraries in cooperative systems and 183 academic libraries as voting members. In addition some nonprofit special libraries, such as the Museum of Natural History, are voting members, while special libraries in business and industry have become nonvoting affiliate members. These systems have a very minimal support level. This provides an executive who facilitates cooperative planning in the area, including regional interlibrary loan programs which draw not only upon the resources of the public libraries but upon the strong academic and special libraries.

But the reference and research program was to operate at the state as well as regional level, so the New York State Interlibrary Loan (NYSILL) program was developed. Through NYSILL, libraries had access to a group of 12 contractual research libraries that are compensated for each search and each loan to the network. The State Library acts as the transmittal point in the automated system, since we should exhaust the resources of the State Library before expending additional public funds.

In 1970 the Commissioner's Committee on Library Development attempted to draw up a plan for library service in New York State involving all types of libraries. It reported a need for a regional approach to school library service, something beyond the individual building and even beyond the school district. While such a network has not been developed, there is increasing thought to having an organized referral pattern from school districts through the major libraries of a public library system, the State Library, and the research libraries.

This report also recommended that the state assume a proportion of the cost of library services roughly similar to its share in the cost of public education — approximately 50 percent. I believe the National Commission is on the right bent with their recommendations for multilevel library funding. It has been our thinking for perhaps five years that the state should assume a larger proportion than it is currently (which I estimate at 17 percent).

I still believe that people are the central cost factor for library systems. Equalization because of area can be justified, but the extent to which it can be justified is a matter of debate. In addition to a per capita factor (45¢), a book expenditure reimbursement factor (40¢ per capita) and a square mile factor ($10), we have a factor based on the number of counties participating. This was an incentive to organize across county lines.

Maryland recently developed an excellent statewide plan. They are trying to lay out what should be done for academic, school, and public libraries. They recommend an increase in the percentage of state support above the present 30 percent to achieve a minimum funding of $6 per capita for public library service.

Pennsylvania led the way in systems development a few years ago, but their pattern of 27 district library centers and four state research centers has lacked some regional coordination and there is not yet a fully effective network. Their 1974 master plan recommends that there be "a Pennsylvania library network with carefully coordinated statewide and regional components . . ." with 12 regional library organizations, and that "the minimum support of library service to the public should be more than doubled within the next five years with state funds matching statewide aggregate local tax support."

California may be the first big state to bring together the resources of public, academic, and special libraries within a sound financial framework. In reviewing their funding structure, they asked the consultant firm of Peat, Marwick, and Mitchell to evaluate their public library system and make recommendations for alternative plans. Their comprehensive review statement was released in June 1975 and became the central document for discussion by California librarians. It concluded that over half of limited state funds had been dedicated to interlibrary loan and that strong back-up collections were needed. Two alternatives were proposed: 1) to focus on an interlibrary loan program, to scrap the present public library systems, and instead designate regional intermediate libraries for resource sharing, and 2) to retain the present systems but strengthen them. In addition, regardless of the route taken, a top level consortium of the strongest six libraries in the state was to be organized to meet demands that could not be filled at the intermediate level. State aid was to be allocated by demand. The thought here was that the best way to distribute funds is on the volume of interlibrary loan and reference requests.

While the consulting firm recommended the first alternative, participants in an institute held to review the report preferred to improve their system structure and rely on a hierarchy. There was favorable reaction to the organization of a consortium, but not entire agreement on its nature. A committee is now further refining the California plan.

SUMMARY OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Participant discussion was a major part of the institute. Institute members formed 13 discussion groups, each of which met for four separate sessions to discuss specific questions on the future of Ohio library development. Members of the discussion groups had been prearranged so that, as nearly as possible, each group included a representative cross section of persons from different types of libraries.

In the first discussion session each group used the Nominal Group Technique to identify the most important issues. Using this approach, each participant suggested issues until the group completed a lengthy list. An effort was then made to achieve group consensus on the five most significant issues that the group identified. Some groups continued to use this technique in all their sessions, but it was only used by all groups for the first discussion.

Five questions were posed during the institute. Since a choice was allowed at some points, not every group addressed itself to each question. The following is a summary of the discussions as reported by leaders or recorders from the 13 groups.

The question posed for deliberation during the first session was: **What are the most important issues which must be resolved in order to make available to all Ohioans a full range of library and information services?**

Altogether, the 13 groups produced more than 300 suggestions. Each group narrowed its list down to the five issues considered most important. Analysis reveals that the following nine topics were cited most frequently:

I Funding
"Increased and new sources of funding" . . . "alternatives to the intangibles tax" . . . "equitable distribution of funds" . . . "acceptance of funding responsibilities by all levels of government and adequate financing of all types and levels of libraries" . . . "future nature of federal, state, and local support."

II Extent to Which Resources Can and Will Be Shared
"Implementation of library network that is truly statewide and effectively utilizes resources of all types of libraries" . . . "organizational format for cooperation" . . . "legal authority for cooperation established" . . . "identification of improvements for intertype library cooperation."

III Involving Users in Definition of Information Needs and Programs
"Greater public participation (a) providing services designed with, not for, users (b) determining more effectively the library public's needs" . . . "establish priorities of citizens' needs (market research)" . . . "more experiments to define and document user needs."

IV Effectiveness of Planning, Implementing, and Evaluating Library Services and Interlibrary Cooperation
"Better measures of input and output and evaluation of services and media" . . . "benefits analysis" . . . "create understanding and/or acceptance of new roles libraries must play in a changing society" . . . "continuous planning/evaluation."

V Public Awareness/Public Relations Orientation
"Public awareness of services available" . . . "public relations — selling the story" . . . "communication."

VI Priority/Goal/Objectives Setting
"Determine exactly which services libraries should provide" . . . "establish realistic priorities" . . . "lack of consensus on goals" . . . "establish new library objectives."

VII Development of Library Staff
"Staff development" . . . "attitude changes of staff and trustees toward new procedures" . . . "formal continuing education activities by library schools, library agencies, and the community at large."

VIII Library Cooperation with Other Agencies
"Greater involvement of community planning agencies and other human service agencies" . . . "communication and cooperation with non-library people and agencies."

IX Library Standards
"Standards clarification and updating impact of technology" . . . "set up consultants and standards in each field of library service."

PRIORITY ITEMS OF EACH GROUP

Group 1
1. Adequate long term financing
2. Public awareness of service available
3. Citizens' input evaluation of community needs
4. Efficient use of funds available
5. Cooperative sharing among all types of libraries

Group 2
1. Need adequate funding
2. How do we use cooperation as a money (or resource) saving technique?
3. Decide priorities
4. How we can best find and share resources we have
5. How to interface types of libraries fiscally and methodologically.

Group 3
1. Sound funding of improved delivery of services
2. Relate goals of library service to values of society
3. Agreement on objectives of library information services
4. Prioritizing libraries as an important segment of the community
5. Identification of improvements for intertype library cooperation

Group 4
1. In light of changing conditions, way to keep income growing to keep pace with inflation
2. Alternatives to the intangibles tax
3. Cooperation among types of libraries
4. Lack of consensus on goals
5. Staff development

Group 5
1. Increased and new sources of funding
2. Public relations — selling the story
3. Greater public participation
   a. providing services designed with, not for, users
   b. determining more effectively the library public's needs
4. Greater involvement of community planning agencies and other human service agencies
5. Better measures of input and output and evaluation of services and media

Group 5 (2 groups identified themselves as #5)
1. Legal authority for cooperation established
2. Willingness to cooperate among different types of libraries
3. Attitude changes of staffs and trustees toward new procedures
4. Equitable reimbursement of resource libraries

Group 6
1. Establish priorities of citizens' needs (market research)
2. Financing and legal structure
3. Interlibrary cooperation (including networks)
4. Communication and cooperation with non-library people and agencies
5. Standards clarification and updating impact of technology

Group 7
1. Funding
2. Assess information needs of users
3. Expanding services to those not using libraries
4. Determine exactly which services libraries should provide
5. Benefiits analysis
6. Articulation of diagnosed user needs with services and funding

Group 8
1. Assuring adequate funding and equitable distribution of funds
2. Better understanding of political issues in improved funding for public services
3. Commitment for all types of libraries to interlibrary cooperation with more communication among libraries
4. Set up consultants and standards in each field of library service
5. Establish a peer or horizontal relationship—rather than subordinate — with other public agencies
6. Create an understanding and/or acceptance of new roles libraries must play in a changing society

Group 9
1. Realistic and sufficient methods of financing to meet local, state, national, and accreditation standards
2. Establish realistic priorities
3. Development and distribution of resources
4. Determine priorities to be funded locally, state or nationally
5. Better communication of goals and cooperation among different types of libraries and informing the public and political arena

Group 10
1. Establishment of sound fiscal basis for library support and equitable distribution
2. Definition of publics to be served
3. Implementation of library network that is truly statewide and effectively utilizes resources of all types of libraries
4. Development of techniques to aid in management information and policy decisions
5. Communication

Group 11
1. Money — new source/distribution for cooperation
2. Organizational format for cooperation
3. Continuous planning/evaluation
4. Effectiveness of library services
5. Identification of needs

Group 12
1. Establish new library objectives
2. Need, ability, willingness of state to provide for State Library and library development
3. Future nature of federal, state, and local support
4. More experimenta to define and document user needs
5. Library studies for optimum use of existing financial resources
6. Formal continuing education activities by library schools, library agencies, and the community at large

Group 13
1. Acceptance of funding responsibilities by levels of government and adequate financing of all types and levels of libraries
2. Adequate financing of all types and levels of libraries
3. Identify and develop dynamic leadership
4. Legal questions clarified
5. Relevancy of library services to user needs

2

The second question presented to the 13 groups for discussion was: **Some issues and problems can be addressed through interlibrary cooperation. The Ohio Library Development Plan is based on interlibrary cooperation but is not yet fully implemented. What changes, if any, should be made in the OLDP to deal with today's issues?**

Participants submitted 132 responses. Since the groups were not requested to rank their ideas in priority order, an exact institute consensus cannot be drawn from the data. However, if the areas of concern indicated by the responses were summarized briefly, they might be stated as follows: *The OLDP should not be scrapped, but carefully rewritten; it should have broad-based input from all sectors of the library community, including users; and it should clearly define and clarify the roles and responsibilities of different types of libraries and agencies. Where necessary, enabling legislation should be sought to facilitate intertype cooperation and to provide adequate funding formulas for such cooperation. Goals and objectives should be made more specific and detailed and should be accompanied by a timetable for their implementation. The new OLDP should reflect a greater user orientation.*

WHAT THEY SAID

The greatest number of responses (31) cited the need for *greater recognition of the specific roles and responsibilities of all types of libraries.* Four groups specified a need to define the role of the State Library more fully; two called attention to the needs of resource libraries and called for inclusion of the role of the information industry in revising the OLDP.

Not unexpectedly, increased attention to the entire question of *financing* received strong participant response (15 citations). The majority of these suggestions urged that a workable federal-state-local funding formula be developed. Other participants urged inclusion of a new section on financing metropolitan library systems, while four responses urged greater emphasis upon direct aid to local libraries.

Greater detail in describing the system development envisioned for the state was cited as a need in 23 responses. Specifically, 16 suggestions dealt with such matters as defining the relationship with the NCLIS plan, the relationship of multicounty cooperatives to Area Library Service Organizations and to metropolitan library systems, as well as the relationship of various systems and subsystems to the state's service districts and planning regions. Seven related suggestions concerned the services systems should provide, e.g., centralized cataloging, reference service, provision of consultants at system's headquarters.

The need for new legislation was cited nine times. Specifically, there were six suggestions calling for enabling legislation which would permit all types of libraries to participate as equals in a system or network. One response sought legislation providing taxing authority for ALSOs.

Reflecting the institute's concern for broad-based participation in planning and cooperation, nine responses urged *careful delineation of the roles of various state agencies,* such as the State Library, the Department of Education, the Board of Regents, and the Department of Corrections.

A related suggestion, namely for attention in the OLDP to the *need for ongoing programs of community support,* was submitted by seven groups. Particular concern was voiced for a plan to generate political and citizen support for a revised OLDP itself.

Five groups urged *greater attention to the needs of special target groups such as the handicapped* and several called for a careful analysis of the needs of all target groups. One group urged decentralization of service to the blind by creating a subregional library for the blind in each ALSO or MCC.

Among the *remaining responses* were the following: clearly define the role of each of the professional library associations (five groups); detail the rationale for cooperation, explaining its advantages and benefits (four groups); identify and define the authority of the body responsible for directing statewide cooperation (two groups).

3

The third question posed for discussion consisted of three parts: **Assuming that multitype network development should be expanded on a phased-in basis over the next 10 years (as recommended by NCLIS),**

a. **What are the important principles upon which a state aid program should be based?**
b. **What programs should be financed in whole or in part by the state (i.e., what are the purposes of the state aid)?**
c. **Which of the programs should have priority in the next two bienniums?**

3a

Eighty-eight suggestions were received in response to part (a) regarding the important principles upon which a state aid program should be based. The great majority of these suggestions, however, could better be described as general advice than as clear statements of principles. In any event, a summary of the 88 responses indicates that participants feel the goals of a state aid program should:

(1) be the equalization of both library access and financing in all parts of the state;
(2) be the product of planning which involves librarians from all types of libraries, and should delineate the service roles of all types of libraries;
(3) establish and/or seek to enforce library standards for each type of library, without infringing upon the autonomy of individual libraries;
(4) include a realistic funding formula for systems which takes into account population differences, size of regions in square miles, and the general economic level of the regions.

WHAT THEY SAID

The 88 suggestions could be analyzed into six categories of concern. Only nine of these were general principles per se. The rest specifically concerned funding, network design, governance, user needs, and standards.

These nine responses could be characterized as *general principles:*

- The "state should pay for services not local in nature."
- "Recognition should be given to special resource centers."
- A "certain percentage of funds should be retained at the state level for research, development, and dissemination, either in-house or by contract with other agencies."
- There should be "recognition of resource libraries to recover costs for systemwide or statewide services and to enrich their collections."
- "Build on the OLDP."
- Require "maintenance of effort."
- There should be "commitment on part of public school administrators on state and local level to direct available funds to library programs."
- "Identify the needs of various types of libraries and how these needs can be met through a statewide plan."
- Where needed there must be "enabling legislation to permit expanded types of interlibrary cooperation."

Thirty-eight suggestions concerned *the state aid aspect of financing libraries.* Of these, 23 stressed the need for "equalization support." Some typical responses: "equitability of tax for financial support"; "the State equalize economic variances"; "funded by equitable tax"; "distribution based on population, per capita support and geography for equalization of library support." Related suggestions included recommendations that funding be based on a formula which would be compatible with the national plan of NCLIS; state responsibility to fund resource libraries should be commensurate with their interlibrary participation; multitype cooperation should be supported primarily by local and state money.

Eighteen responses concerned *principles applicable to network design and operation.* Of these, five stressed the need for inclusion of all types of libraries in networks, systems, and cooperatives. An additional six responses expressed a concern that competing, noncompatible cooperatives not be allowed to develop ("size of network must be economically sound," "avoid waste and unnecessary duplication").

Nine groups responded with *principles of governance.* Almost all of these (seven) stressed autonomy, while the remaining two urged creation of an independent governing body consisting of representatives of all types of libraries "to review and modify the basic principles of Ohio library development."

For eight groups, the *state aid program must have a strong user-needs orientation:* "concentration on needed basic services—lending, information service (direct service to library clientele);" "concern for specialized services to target groups — specifically the blind, handicapped, homebound, and institutionalized"; "marketing research program to study whether services meet actual needs."

Six groups noted the *central importance of library standards and their use:* "minimal functional standards developed for all participating libraries," "design and enforcement of library standards," "continuous evaluation and periodic appraisal," "small and varied teams of library personnel (not only professionals) for onsite visitations and interaction."

3b

The second part of question 3 attempted to gather feedback on *what programs should be financed in whole or in part by the state?*

Sixty-nine responses were received. These could be classified into six categories:

(1) Systems development

Almost half (31) of the suggestions (emanating from all 13 groups) could be classified as dealing with systems development in one form or another, e.g., support for OCLC, adequate reimbursement for resource libraries in cooperatives, etc. Some typical suggestions in this area were: "State should support start-up and operating costs of networks" . . . "state should support regional film library" . . . "further development of the ALSO program should be fully funded" . . . "development and funding of statewide communication system" . . . "major resource library grants" . . . "funding of statewide delivery system" . . . "assist OCLC in development of new capabilities" . . . "retrospective conversion of resource collections to OCLC."

(2) Research and development

Twelve suggestions from nine groups urged that significant state support should be directed towards programs of research and development. Among the responses were the following: "Research and development division of State Library" . . . "support for research for new technology and systems, including interlibrary loan" . . . "funds for evaluation of existing resources, facilities, and capabilities" . . . "grants to develop needs assessment methods" . . . "development of statewide design of networks."

(3) Outreach

Nine groups suggested various forms of outreach programs for partial or complete state funding. Sample responses included: "Programs should be developed to reach the unserved" . . . "services to disadvantaged by all types of libraries through total state support" . . . "services to blind, physically handicapped, aged, and homebound, supported entirely through state funds" . . . "institutional library support."

(4) Direct aid

Five groups recommended direct aid to local libraries. The most comprehensive statement of this issue read: "Grants for (a) assistance to particular libraries to reach the minimum functional standards; (b) innovative systemwide services."

(5) Coordinating mechanism

Five groups cited the need for a coordinating mechanism to encourage system development. One recorder wrote: "An independent governing council representative of all types of libraries should be established to review and modify the basic principles of Ohio library development." Another group recommended "coordination of networking by the State Library."

(6) Others

The remaining responses urged state funding for continuing education programs (five groups) and assistance in developing effective public relations on the local level.

3c

Question (c) asked: **Which of the programs should have priority in the next two bienniums?** The first list below ranks the suggestions by the number of times they were submitted by participants. The second list indicates the priority given the suggestions (each group's first priority item was given five points; second priority, 4 points; third priority, 3 points; etc.)

I

1. Systems development — 31 responses
2. Research and development — 12
3. Outreach programs — 9
4. Direct aid — 5
5. Coordinating mechanism — 5
6. Continuing education — 5
7. Public relations — 2

II

1. Systems development — 88 points
2. Research and development — 34
3. Coordinating mechanism — 19
4. Direct aid — 18
5. Outreach programs — 16
6. Continuing education — 8
7. Public relations — 4

The only change in ranking concerns the recommendation for a coordinating mechanism to encourage system development. Although ranked below "outreach" and "direct aid" in frequency of citation, this need was ranked higher in priority, indicating that although fewer participants cited it, they gave it a higher comparable importance.

At the fourth discussion session, participants were given a choice of two questions. The first alternative (Question 4) asked: **What are the principal roles each type of library should play in future multitype interlibrary cooperation?**

Only five of the 13 groups elected to respond to this question. In general, their responses appear to be adequately summed up in the words of group #8: "Type of library is not a critical issue; each library should be responsible for provision of materials to its clientele and sharing of materials with other libraries. Insofar as possible, basic materials should be provided locally." Other reports, however, differed in varying degrees from this group's. As an example, one group stated the "roles of each type of library:

- may differ from various kinds of projects;
- all types of libraries may be resource centers;
- university and college: reference and information;
- schools: A-V, media materials."

Another group submitted its analysis of roles in the form of a comprehensive matrix.

The second alternative (Question 5) asked: **What procedures do you suggest for insuring further participation by (a) members of this institute, and by (b) the entire Ohio library community, in statewide planning for interlibrary cooperation and library development after today?**

A total of 52 responses were submitted to this question. Nine groups contributed 25 suggestions in response to part (a) on the role of institute participants. Twelve groups contributed 27 suggestions in response to part (b) on the role of the entire Ohio library community.

By integrating the responses to both parts of Question 5 into a summary statement, the following points stand out:

- There was unanimous agreement that *the institute should be viewed as an important first step in an ongoing process* of communication and planning involving librarians from all types of libraries.
- There was general agreement that the Ohio library community must recognize some planning authority to continue the work begun at the institute —whether the role is filled by the State Library and cooperating groups or by a new "coordinating council" to be formed by representatives from all types of libraries.
- There was concern expressed that a written summary of the institute proceedings be made available at the earliest possible date and given widest possible dissemination.

WHAT THEY SAID

Responses to part (a) on the role of members of the institute: The nine groups responding to this part of the question had two general observations: 16 suggestions stressed the importance of institute members serving as "information links" with their library colleagues, conveying the highlights of the institute's proceedings to them and relaying feedback to a post-institute committee, and the other nine suggestions recommended further meetings—either in conjunction with the OLA regional meetings or as separate follow-up gatherings for the original institute participants.

Responses to part (b) on the role of the entire Ohio library community: The 27 suggestions recorded here fall into four general areas. Four groups cited the need for a series of regional conferences on the topic of interlibrary cooperation; five groups urged the formation of a coordinating mechanism broadly representative of the library community; six groups urged the drafting of a new, comprehensive OLDP; six urged the widest possible dissemination of a thorough report on the institute and its proceedings.

NEXT STEPS

Two impressions emerge clearly from the institute. The first (which derived from this opportunity to step back and review the Ohio scene) is genuine surprise at the accomplishment in library development and the growth of interlibrary cooperation in the past six years. The second is readiness for greater participation on the part of libraries of all types in the interlibrary cooperation which has been initiated under the Ohio Library Development Plan.

Responses to the discussion questions suggest the following reflects the thinking of the majority of institute participants.

1. Improved funding is the major concern of the library community. Whether expressed as a concern of local libraries or of systems, whether directed towards alternatives to the intangibles tax or changes in federal funding, the need for improving library support rings out clearly as having first priority with institute participants.

2. Adequate representation of all types of libraries in future planning is strongly endorsed. Participants repeatedly noted that representatives from all types of libraries must share in planning, and that the roles of all types of libraries must be clearly spelled out in any future state plan.

3. Clear and detailed goals and objectives are needed. Participants believed that principles of cooperation and system development have been widely discussed at the general goal level, and that revised statewide planning should contain specific program objectives on which action should be taken.

4. Interlibrary cooperation is strongly endorsed by all segments of the Ohio library community. Enthusiasm for cooperative statewide development was unanimous. Many participants were genuinely surprised at the extent of current cooperative activities and expressed eagerness to go further in this direction to prepare Ohio for full participation in the national network as it develops.

Running throughout the institute was the recognition that responsibilities for library services in Ohio are shared by many people. Because Ohio's nearly 3,000 libraries form a complex of autonomous systems and subsystems, the resulting autonomy makes a decision to participate in interlibrary cooperation a conscious commitment by individuals and institutions. And conversely, a decision not to participate is also a conscious decision.

The responsibility for follow-up from this institute, too, rests upon individuals and institutions — librarians and governing boards of all types of libraries.

- The professional associations and their boards face decisions: To what extent will they involve themselves in statewide planning and the encouragement of interlibrary cooperation? How much energy and resources will they commit to securing legislative and financial support for library development and interlibrary cooperation?
- The Area Library Service Organization and multicounty cooperatives face decisions: How quickly will they adjust to taxpayer and user expectations and encourage the participation of academic, school, and special libraries?
- The State Library Board, staff, and advisory committees need to use the institute findings to update *The Ohio Long Range Program for Improvement of Library Services* and frame a program for the 1978-1979 biennium.
- Individual libraries must decide their degree of commitment to change and development, and assess interlibrary cooperation as a means of improving services to their communities.

The Ohio Library Development Plan has served as a focus for library planning and action for some seven years. Its statement on local, state, and association responsibilities has proved as important as the three-part action program. The institute discussions suggest that the OLDP can become a vehicle for further, more specific action, involving more people in determining Ohio library services of the 1980's. As we check the institute against the four purposes outlined on page 1, we see these next steps:

1. Each professional and trustee organization and the government agencies concerned with library service should be asked to formally state their commitment to multitype interlibrary cooperation, and as a first step they should be asked to assist in the formation of an ad hoc Ohio Multitype Interlibrary Cooperation Committee. This Committee will have responsibility to:
   a. Stimulate area and other meetings at which interlibrary cooperation and the institute findings will be discussed in order to secure additional input for a statewide multitype interlibrary cooperation program, and to generate future support for that program.
   b. Prepare a statewide multitype interlibrary cooperation program (a revised OLDP?) that can be endorsed by each library and trustee organization and by the State Library Board, the Board of Regents, and the State Department of Education.
   c. Spearhead activity to implement that statewide multitype interlibrary cooperation program and cooperate with the library development committees of the several organizations.
   d. Take leadership in developing appropriate Ohio conferences which may be needed to prepare for the White House Conference on Library and Information Services.
2. To form this ad hoc Committee, each of the professional and trustee organizations (ALAO, ASIS, EMCO, OASL, OLA, OLTA, SLA) and the State Library Board should designate a representative (at the officer, board member, or major committee chairperson level) to this Committee. The Board of Regents, the State Department of Education, and the "Ohio Friends of the Library" should also be asked to each designate a representative to this Committee. In addition the State Library Board should appoint an additional four members-at-large to the Committee, such members-at-large to be selected from recommendations made by the various associations and agencies to ensure that the Committee is broadly representative of the several types and sizes of libraries, geography, and interlibrary cooperative ventures. This will provide a committee of 15 members.
3. The ad hoc Ohio Multitype Interlibrary Cooperation Committee Chairman should immediately consult with the Chairman of the Ohio Library Association Library Development Committee to offer assistance to that Committee as it updates the Ohio Library Development Program. The OLA Library Development Committee has the objective of having a draft revised OLDP by October, 1976.
4. The State Library Board should allocate funds to assist the Ohio Multitype Interlibrary Cooperation Committee in its work, and the State Librarian should act as convenor of the ad hoc Committee.
5. The ad hoc Ohio Multitype Interlibrary Cooperation Committee should set as its goal to have the statewide library development program endorsed by library and trustee organizations, the State Library Board, the Board of Regents, and the Ohio Department of Education, and have implementation under way by October, 1977.

OSU INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION PLANNING INSTITUTE

Participants

*M. Paul Schrenk, Jr.
University of Akron
Chairman

Thomas A. Anderson
Trustee, Toledo-Lucas County Public Library

Ralph C. Atkinson
The Ohio State University

Lon Axtell
Miami University

Anne Barry
Wheelersburg High School, Cleveland

Flora Beaton
Oregon Board of Education

Janet Berg
Carnegie Public Library, Marion

*Edith S. Booher
Franklin Public Library

Carol M. Bretton
Cincinnati Law Library Association

Jack E. Brown
Ohio Department of Education

L. Eugene Byers
Trustee, Loudonville Public Library

Janet Carpenter
Youngstown Public Schools

Mary Copeland
Solon Village

*William Chait
Dayton and Montgomery County Public Library

*Robert C. Chesshir
Cleveland Health Sciences Library

*Sarah Cody
Cleveland Heights - University Heights Public Library
Chairman, Resource Materials Subcommittee

Gloria Coles
Toledo-Lucas County Public Library

Rebecca Cordner
Toledo Mental Health Center

Arthur Curley
Cuyahoga County Public Library

Charlotte Dale
The State Library of Ohio

*J. Dennis Day
Troy-Miami County Public Library

A. T. Dickinson
Mansfield Public Library

Max Drake
Member, State Library Board

Martha Driver
The State Library of Ohio
Liaison for the Institute

Kenneth Dunham
Marion Correction Institution

Hugh Dubin
Columbus Public Schools

Sidney C. Ebbott
The Ohio State University

Kevin Flaherty
The State Library of Ohio

Elsie A. Fleming
Otterbein College

L. Ronald Freemeyer
Wright State University

James Fry
The State Library of Ohio

Phyllis Gelb
Wry Public Library, Perrysburg

A. J. Goldwyn
Case Western Reserve University School of Library Science

Esther Grassberg
Case Western Reserve University

Ann Weisehoed Herring
Ohio Department of Education
Chairman, Composition of the Institute Subcommittee

Judith Hastings
Northeastern Library District (NORWELD)

Lucille Hastings
West Holmes Local School, Millersburg

Steven Hawk
Miami Valley Library Organization (MILO)

**Lee Henning
Trustee, Ada Public Library

Faith Hess
The State Library of Ohio

**James Hunt
Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County

Valerie Jenkins
Steele Media Center, Amherst

Herbert F. Johnson
Oberlin College/Public Libraries

James V. Jones
Case Western Reserve University

Doris Jyurovet
Stow Public Library

Jon D. Kelton
Wilmington Public Library

Frederick G. Kilgour
Ohio College Library Center

Maurice Goodrich Klein
Ohio Valley Area Libraries (OVAL)

Philip Koons
The State Library of Ohio

Julian R. Larson
Chemical Abstracts Service

Charles W. Lee
Lima State Hospital

Charlotte Leonard
Dayton and Montgomery County Public Library

Clark Lewis
New Philadelphia - Tuscarawas County Public Library

*Margaret Lindley
Mansfield City Schools

Sarah Long
The State Library of Ohio

Eunice Lovejoy
The State Library of Ohio

David Luse
The State Library of Ohio

*Hannah V. McCauley
Ohio University, Lancaster Campus

Jane Ann McGregor
Ohio Valley Area Libraries (OVAL)

Cynthia McLaughlin
The State Library of Ohio

Charles E. Maurer
Denison University

Catherine Meisel
The State Library of Ohio

Judith K. Meyers
Lakewood Board of Education

John W. Mitchell
Kent State University
Consultant to the Committee

Robert E. Monteven
University of Dayton

Bob Lee Mowery
Wittenberg University

Ray Mulhern
Southeastern Ohio Regional Library

Leslie C. Naylor
Toledo-Lucas County Public Library

**Mark Neyman
Washington County Public Library, Marietta

Marian L. Parker
Wood County District Public Library, Bowling Green

*A. Chapman Parsons
Ohio Library Association/Ohio Library Trustees Association

*James B. Patrick
President, Ohio Library Trustees Association

Martha Pervozil
Library Consultant

John J. Philip
The State Library of Ohio

Ira Phillips
The State Library of Ohio

James H. Pickering
Werner Public Library, Springfield

Isabelle Pratt
Findlay City Schools

Katherine Prescott
Cleveland Public Library

Mary Hudak Rawlings
Upper Arlington High School

John H. Rebensdorf
Akron-Summit County Public Library

Emelyne Sly Reed
Trustee, Chillicothe and Ross County Public Library

Dwight W. Robinson
Ashland College

A. Robert Rogers
Kent State University School of Library Science

Donald J. Sager
Public Library of Delaware and Franklin County

Hal B. Schell
University of Cincinnati

J. Kaye Schneider
Western Ohio Regional Library Development System (WORLDS)

Clyde S. Seeley
John McIntire Public Library, Zanesville

Edward Seely
INFO Libraries

Marie-Louise Shedlock
Chillicothe and Ross County Public Library

*Joseph F. Shubert
The State Library of Ohio

**Dorothy Sinclair
Case Western Reserve University School of Library Science
Chairman, Program Format Subcommittee

Shirley J. Slappey
Warren Public Library

Claudine Smith
The State Library of Ohio

**Evelina Smith
Kent State University, Trumbull Campus

John M. Stanek
Lima Public Library

C. B. Steel
McKinley Memorial Library, Niles

*Daniel Sterett
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility

Cyril H. Sykes
Northwestern Ohio Rural Librarian (NWORL)

Lucille Thigpen
Central Ohio Interlibrary Network (COIN)

*Virginia Tiefel
Hiram College

Therese Tkachuk
Northeastern Ohio Library Association (NEOLA)

Alice M. Vesely
Member, State Library Board

Ann Walker
The State Library of Ohio

John S. Wallach
Greene County Public Library, Xenia

Richard S. Wilson
Lorain Public Library

**Doris Wood
Clermont County Public Library, Batavia

Virginia S. Yaggie
The Ohio State University

Robert A. Yoder
Kent State University

Lawrence R. Pope
The Ohio State University
Institute Program Coordinator

*Planning Committee Member
**Member of Planning Committee but did not attend Institute

The OSU Interlibrary Cooperation Planning Institute and the printing of this publication were assisted by funds provided under the Federal Library Services and Construction Act, Title III, Interlibrary Cooperation.